

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, October 4, 2001
MAG Office
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS PRESENT

Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman
Scottsdale: Dennis Enriquez for Larry Person
Chandler: Jim Weiss
*Gilbert: Danielle Typinski
Glendale: Doug Kukino
Mesa: Christine Zielonka
Phoenix: Gaye Knight
Tempe: Tom Moore
Citizen Representative: Phil Noplos for Walter Bouchard
Arizona Lung Association: David Feuerherd
Salt River Project: Greg Witherspoon
*Southwest Gas Corporation: Brian O'Donnell
*Arizona Public Service Company: Scott Davis
Western States Petroleum Association: Gina Grey
Regional Public Transportation Authority: Bryan Jungwirth
Arizona Motor Transport Association: Dave Berry
*Maricopa County Farm Bureau: Jeannette Fish
*Arizona Rock Products Association: Samuel Aubrey

*Associated General Contractors: David Martin
*Homebuilders Association of Central Arizona:
Connie Wilhelm-Garcia
American Institute of Architects- Central Arizona:
H. Maynard Blumer
*Valley Forward: Peter Allard
*University of Arizona - Cooperative Extension:
Monica Pastor
*Arizona Department of Transportation: Pat Cupell
Arizona Department of Environmental Quality:
Peter Hyde
Maricopa County Environmental Services
Department: Bob Downing for Jo Crumbaker
*Arizona Department of Weights and Measures: Mark Ellery
Federal Highway Administration: Dennis Mittelstedt
Arizona State University: Judi Nelson
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community:
Stan Belone for B. Bobby Ramirez
*Citizen Representative: David Rueckert
*Phoenix Chamber of Commerce: Ian Calkins

*Those members were neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Doug Collins, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dan Cook, City of Chandler
Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments
Scott DiBiase, Maricopa Association of Governments
Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments
Corrinne Maran, City of Phoenix
Robert Kamioz, City of Phoenix

Lindy Bauer, Maricopa Association of Governments
Roger Roy, Maricopa Association of Governments
Jean Parkinson, Pinal County Air Quality Control District
Sarath Joshua, Maricopa Association of Governments
Susie Stevens-Matthews, Fennemore Craig
Colleen McKaughan, Environmental Protection Agency

1. Call to Order

A meeting of the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee was conducted on October 4, 2001. Stephen Cleveland, City of Goodyear, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the August 30, 2001 Meeting Minutes

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the August 30, 2001 meeting. Doug Kukino, City of Glendale, moved, and Bryan Jungwirth, Regional Public Transportation Authority, seconded, and the motion to approve the August 30, 2001 meeting minutes carried unanimously.

3. 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report

Cathy Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, provided an overview of the 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report to members of the Committee. Ms. Arthur indicated that for 1999, 2000, and 2001, MAG is required to submit a Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) Forecasting and Tracking Report to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). These reports are prepared to satisfy a commitment in the MAG 1999 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area. The purpose of the annual VMT forecasting and tracking report is to ensure that forecasts used in the Plan remain accurate through the carbon monoxide attainment date of December 31, 2000.

Ms. Arthur mentioned that the accuracy of the VMT forecasts is based on a comparison with actual VMT reported by the Arizona Department of Transportation in the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) submission made to the Federal Highway Administration. Ms. Arthur noted that the 2001 report was scheduled to be submitted to the EPA by September 30, 2001, however HPMS data required to prepare the report was not available from ADOT until September 21, 2001. She noted that EPA guidance specifies that for any year, the actual VMT must not exceed the Plan forecast by more than three percent and the cumulative increases for 1998, 1999, and 2000 must not exceed the 2000 Plan forecast by more than five percent. In addition, the updated travel demand model forecast for 2000 must not exceed the travel demand model forecast in the Plan by more than three percent.

Ms. Arthur noted that comments on the Draft 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report are due by October 19, 2001. It is anticipated the report would be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency by November 15, 2001 after consultation among all affected agencies and acceptance by the MAG Regional Council.

Peter Hyde, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, inquired about the difference between the two predicted values for the year 2000 found on Table 1, Page 3, of the report. Ms. Arthur responded that the VMT forecast represents average annual daily traffic while the CO Plan Travel Demand Model VMT represents average weekday traffic. Mr. Cleveland requested that Mr. Hyde work with Ms. Arthur to develop language that clarifies the table in the report. Tom Moore, City of Tempe, inquired if the VMT report applies to other nonattainment areas. Ms. Arthur replied that it was a requirement for carbon monoxide nonattainment areas designated as serious. Mr. Moore asked about the basis for forecasting future traffic and if it included induced travel. Ms. Arthur responded that the models do utilize a speed feedback loop that takes into account congested facilities and shorter trip lengths. Gaye Knight, City of Phoenix, noted the timing for this item is odd and that she was uncomfortable approving a report that was out for agency review. Christine Zielonka, City of Mesa, inquired if the most recent Census data was included in the models. Ms. Arthur replied that the modeled socioeconomic assumptions were based on 1995 special census data. MAG is working on new population projections for 2002 based on the 2000 Census. Maynard Blumer, American Institute of Architects, indicated that the traffic analysis zone map was unreadable. Ms. Arthur explained that this map is in the appendix and is an excerpt from the Revised MAG 1999 Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan.

Mr. Cleveland made a few observations regarding the report including the need for a better explanation of the EPA standards and the addition of the target and cumulative standards in the table. Furthermore, he asked why MAG would not want to continue the tracking reports in the future. Ms. Arthur replied that MAG could continue to report HPMS VMT results independent of EPA reporting, but the Serious Area Carbon Monoxide Plan does not forecast VMT past 2000. Mr. Blumer indicated MAG should have a target established. Ms. Bauer indicated staff would present findings back to the Committee. Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Administration, indicated that for comparison purposes it would be useful. Ms. Arthur added that MAG conducts a traffic count study every few years

and in the Spring of 2002, nearly 5,000 traffic counts will be taken to compare with model results. Mr. Moore indicated that there needs to be an emphasis on traffic counting, modeling, and vehicle classifications so that the locations of where VMT accumulates and the percentage of through-traffic are known.

Ms. Arthur indicated these were excellent points. She noted that in travel on model assignments, the percentage of trucks on each link is known. In addition, through-trips are assigned explicitly by the travel model, but the vehicle types in the model do not exactly fit the classifications required by the emissions models. Mr. Cleveland summarized points made during the discussion on this item, including: augment the table to make it easier to understand; EPA target standards versus local standards; extend the VMT tracking reports; identify cost implications to budget; and the 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report recommendation of acceptance was subject to other agency review. Mr. Blumer moved and Ms. Knight seconded to recommend acceptance of the 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report to the MAG Management Committee, subject to consultation.

4. Use of Federal CMAQ Funding

Dennis Mittelstedt, Federal Highway Administration, expressed compliments to Ms. Bauer and Ms. Arthur on the conformity issues presented at the Western States Intermodal Planning Group (IPG) 2001 Annual Conference recently hosted by MAG. Mr. Mittelstedt discussed the purpose and appropriate uses of the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds. He noted that the federal CMAQ guidelines are comprehensive and that he would focus on projects that do the most good.

Mr. Mittelstedt mentioned a list of projects in no priority order, including: turn lanes, especially at the most congested intersections or interchanges; traffic signal coordination projects; intelligent transportation system projects; vanpools; more buses (new and expanded bus service); paving dirt roads (especially those having sufficient average daily traffic); freeway management projects; bicycle projects (with an emphasis on more stringent evaluation to select projects which will receive the most usage); pedestrian projects (overpass projects are difficult to justify economically); safety projects (however, other categories of funds are available); and, he noted that traffic calming projects are not eligible, except on a case by case basis.

Mr. Mittelstedt informed the Committee that MAG has developed one of the better CMAQ methodologies available and that many projects are not easy to quantify. Mr. Jungwirth indicated that from a transit perspective demand management programs, light rail (environmental impact statement, right-of-way, or construction), and vehicle replacement programs are really needed for the region. In addition, Mr. Jungwirth stated that a specific percent of federal funds goes to freeway expansion through 2014 and more consideration must be given for transit projects in future processes.

Mr. Jungwirth inquired about the use of CMAQ for street sweepers. Mr. Mittelstedt indicated he supported street sweepers and the equipment is effective if used frequently. Mr. Blumer mentioned that the list represented 1950s planning concepts; more education programs with high powered seminars are needed to receive the latest philosophies on planning. He noted Boulder, Colorado, as an example. He indicated there should be an exception for traffic calming. Ms. Knight asked if the Federal Highway Administration had a similar process to evaluate projects. Mr. Mittelstedt replied that the FHWA relies on work from the MAG committees. Ms. Knight asked how the FHWA rates projects. Mr. Mittelstedt responded that he relies on the MAG methodology and that the intent is to focus on improvements to alleviate congestion and improve air quality. He noted further that the FHWA does not have better numbers; generally FHWA checks to see that a proper evaluation has been made, the project is eligible, and reviews the calculations. The primary call is eligibility.

Mr. Mittelstedt mentioned that the area needs to remain vigilant in reducing PM-10 especially with the purchase of certified street sweepers. Mr. Moore indicated that the CMAQ program has been around for ten years and in his review of the guidance was struck by the purpose of the program which acts as an air quality improvement program. He inquired how CMAQ has been used in other states and how the projects measure up to projects undertaken in Los Angeles, St. Louis, and New York City. Mr. Mittelstedt replied that projects in Maricopa County are in the same ballpark as those in other regions, although this area is higher for CMAQ use for bus projects.

In conclusion, Mr. Mittelstedt noted that MAG has developed a good evaluation tool in the CMAQ methodology and the committees should continue to target projects with the greatest potential number of users.

5. Evaluation of Proposed CMAQ Projects for the FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP

Ms. Arthur, Maricopa Association of Governments, commented that based on the questions regarding the CMAQ and programming processes, it may be helpful for members of the Committee to review the FY 2003-2007 Transportation Improvement Program Guidance Report (TGR). The TGR, which is provided to the member agencies, provides information on what agencies need to do to request projects.

Ms. Arthur presented the evaluation of proposed Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement projects submitted for the FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. Ms. Arthur indicated that 73 projects were submitted and 62 have been quantified. She mentioned that for FY 2007, approximately \$37.5 million in CMAQ is available. Ms. Arthur provided a review of Attachment A included in the agenda packet. Evaluation measures include emission reduction in terms of kilograms per day and cost effectiveness for total cost and federal cost in terms of annual cost per metric ton reduced. In addition, the Congestion Management System (CMS) score has been listed and is based primarily on average daily traffic. Ms. Arthur indicated that projects in Attachment A are ranked on cost effectiveness based on the total project cost. Ms. Arthur provided a description of projects that, based on total cost effectiveness, ranked in the "Top 25". The 25 most cost-effective projects included: paving dirt roads, PM-10 certified street sweepers, other "air quality" projects such as regional rideshare, trip reduction program, and ozone education, intelligent transportation system projects, projects to purchase vans for vanpools, paving dirt shoulders, multi-use path, bicycle lane, and the Tempe Transit Center. Ms. Arthur explained that the Committee was requested to make a recommendation to forward the CMAQ evaluation to the MAG Transportation Review Committee and modal committees for use in prioritizing projects.

Ms. Arthur then reviewed Attachment B. She mentioned that Attachment B included an evaluation of proposed air quality CMAQ projects for the FY 2003-2007 Transportation Improvement Program. She noted that the projects had been listed based on the cost effectiveness of the total project cost. Many of the air quality projects had been quantified for the first time based on new methodologies and the priority order was very similar to how the Committee ranked the projects last year. Ms. Arthur indicated the "Electronic Village" project should be removed from this list, as this project would be evaluated by the MAG Telecommunications Advisory Group. Ms. Arthur explained that the Committee was requested to rank the Air Quality projects to be forwarded to the MAG Transportation Review Committee for the November 6, 2001 meeting.

Dave Berry, Arizona Motor Transport Association, inquired about the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee representation on the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC). Ms. Bauer indicated that the improvement that was made was to have the Chairmen of the modal committees present emphasis areas to the TRC. She noted for example that as Chairman of the Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee (AQTAC), Mr. Cleveland presents air quality issues to the TRC. Ms. Bauer responded that the Committee had made a recommendation that they have a representative on the TRC a year ago and the Committee could make that recommendation again if the Committee so desires. Mr. Berry moved and Mr. Cleveland seconded to recommend AQTAC representation on the TRC. Mr. Moore noted that given the purpose and intent of the CMAQ funds, a parallel process to the one carried out by the TRC is needed. Mr. Cleveland asked if the TRC could provide a supporting role to the AQTAC in the selection of projects. Mr. Berry indicated he would support this idea. Mr. Blumer mentioned that as an advisory committee, the Committee plays a huge role in providing air quality factors to the TRC. Ms. Bauer replied that the Regional Council established the TRC for transportation purposes. She added that one improvement is that the recommendations will go to the TRC, the TRC will recommend a funding level for the air quality projects, and then the AQTAC will meet to review project rankings and the available funding to make a final recommendation on which projects should be recommended for funding to the TRC.

Mr. Berry indicated project priorities needed a paradigm shift. To get the most bang for the buck, he proposed spending the entire \$30 million on street sweepers. Mr. Moore countered that to maintain the three air quality standards, the region should not spend all the funds on projects to reduce particulates. Mr. Moore indicated a specific discussion about the process needs to take place and to make improvements to the process, the Committee needs to work with transportation colleagues. Mr. Cleveland indicated that we should honor the process currently in place and try to make improvements next May before submission of new projects.

Mr. Jungwirth mentioned that there are certain laws requiring transportation demand projects. He also noted that although the ozone education project was only funded through this year, the Regional Public Transportation Authority has proposed an ozone education project in FY 2007 to address the eight-hour standard. Ms. Zielonka inquired about the Capitol Rideshare Program. Ms. Knight added that the State of Arizona was the only employer to receive CMAQ for conducting a rideshare program. She indicated the State should pay for their own rideshare program. Ms. Zielonka indicated that the Capitol Rideshare project should be removed from Attachment B. Judy Nelson, Arizona State University, mentioned that she had previously worked at the County as a transportation coordinator and that Capitol Rideshare has provided no assistance to the rideshare efforts at Arizona State University. Ms. Knight indicated State law required state agency participation in rideshare programs. Gina Grey, Western State Petroleum Association inquired about the emissions reduction for the proposed CMAQ projects in Attachment A. She indicated the emissions reduction is too general to make a decision and that carbon monoxide, total organic gases, and PM-10 be listed separately. Ms. Arthur responded that the pollutants can be listed separately. Mr. Jungwirth moved, and Ms. Knight seconded, and the motion carried unanimously to recommend forwarding the CMAQ evaluation as presented in Attachment A to the MAG Transportation Review Committee and modal committees for use in prioritizing projects.

Ms. Knight moved, and Ms. Zielonka seconded, and the motion carried to rank the Air Quality projects in Attachment B removing "Electronic Village" and deleting "Capitol Rideshare" and to forward the list to the MAG Transportation Review Committee for the November 6, 2001 meeting. Projects in Attachment B were recommended as follows: (1) Purchase PM-10 Certified Street Sweepers; (2) Regional Rideshare Program; (3) Trip Reduction Program; (4) Telework Outreach Program; (5) Education and Promotion to Reduce Ozone Pollution; and, (6) Clean Fuel and Diesel Engine Emissions Control System Retrofit Pilot Project. Mr. Jungwirth abstained from voting on Attachment B.

6. Evaluation of Proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper Projects for FY 2002 CMAQ Funding

Dean Giles, Maricopa Association of Governments, briefed the Committee on the status of FY 2001 street sweeper requests. He mentioned that in October 2000, the Committee recommended a prioritized list of sweeper projects for FY 2001 CMAQ funding. In FY 2001, \$960,000 was set aside for the purchase of sweepers. Then as part of the FY 2001 federal aid close out, an additional \$1.7 million was set aside for the purchase of remaining sweeper projects requested in FY 2001. Funding is available now for all 21 street sweeper requests received for FY 2001.

Mr. Giles presented the evaluation of proposed PM-10 certified street sweeper projects for FY 2002 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding. He mentioned that following the submission of FY 2002 sweeper requests, MAG staff evaluated the proposed projects for emissions reduction and cost effectiveness based on the latest CMAQ Methodology. There is \$960,000 set aside for funding PM-10 certified street sweepers in FY 2002. Fifteen projects were received, requesting \$2 million. Mr. Giles added that in the agenda item attachment, the projects were ranked in order of cost effectiveness based on the total project cost. He also noted that additional supplemental information was supplied and included on the attachment. Mr. Giles indicated that the Committee was requested to recommend a prioritized list of the proposed sweeper projects for FY 2002 funding and to retain the prioritized list for additional federal funding made available to the region. The recommendation will be forwarded to the MAG Management Committee.

Ms. Zielonka indicated that there is a benefit to an equitable resource allocation and the Glendale representative concurred, prior to departing from the meeting. Jim Weiss, City of Chandler, agreed with this approach noting that each agency would receive one sweeper before an agency would receive a second. Ms. Knight indicated that although the City of Phoenix had submitted two project requests that ranked number three and four on the list, she agreed to the approach presented by Mr. Weiss. Mr. Cleveland noted that based on this approach, the prioritized list would be as follows: (1) Tempe; (2) Mesa; (3) Phoenix; (4) Avondale; (5) Gilbert; (6) Glendale; (7) Surprise; (8) Peoria; (9) Chandler; (10) Phoenix; (11) Avondale; (12) Gilbert; (13) Glendale; (14) Peoria; and, (15) Chandler. Scott DiBiase, Maricopa Association of Governments, indicated that projects through number seven may be funded with available FY 2002 CMAQ funds. Ms. Zielonka moved, Mr. Moore seconded, and the motion carried unanimously to recommend a prioritized list of proposed PM-10 Certified Street Sweeper projects for FY 2002 CMAQ funding and to retain the prioritized list for additional redistributed obligation authority, or federal funds made available to this region, resulting from adjustments due to the federal revenue aligned budget authority.

Mr. Moore inquired if Maricopa County has requested PM-10 certified street sweepers through this process. Mr. Giles replied that Maricopa County has not applied for street sweeper funding. Dennis Enriquez, City of Scottsdale, asked if funding was available to retrofit solid waste collection vehicles with street sweeping equipment. Mr. Mittelstedt indicated that a test could be made as a one-time pilot project. Mr. Jungwirth added that it was a great idea; however there could be issues with retrofitting certified street sweeping equipment. Ms. Grey inquired if the City of Glendale requests were evaluated based on the use of alternative fuel. Mr. Giles indicated that the CMAQ Methodology developed does estimate emissions reduction based on alternative fuel use, and therefore the Glendale project includes this emissions reduction. Ms. Grey asked why the emissions reduced would be low. Ms. Arthur responded that the major factor contributing to the emission reductions attributable to PM-10 efficient street sweepers is a reduction in reentrained dust on paved roads. Reductions due to alternative fuels are very small in comparison. Mr. Cleveland requested that the Committee be provided with an overview of how CMAQ has been expended. Mr. Moore indicated that to implement effective programs, the region needs to continue looking into the future.

7. Court Ruling on Remote Sensing Lawsuit

Ms. Bauer provided an overview on the court ruling issued September 12, 2001 by the U.S. District Court in the Remote Sensing lawsuit filed by the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest. The Remote Sensing Program was eliminated by the Arizona Legislature in April 2000.

Colleen McKaughan, Environmental Protection Agency, indicated the EPA was working with the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest on options to address the court ruling.

8. Call to the Public

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the MAG Air Quality Technical Advisory Committee. No comments were presented.

9. Call for Future Agenda Items

Mr. Cleveland announced that for the next meeting, the Committee would consider the PM-10 Street Sweeper Study, regional haze, and would hear from staff on information requested by the Committee. Mr. Cleveland noted that Mr. Hyde would assist Ms. Arthur with improvements to the 2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel Forecasting and Tracking Report. Ms. Knight mentioned timing of these items and indicated the agenda packet was received two days in advance of the meeting. She indicated a calendar that provided when items would be considered by the Committee would be helpful. Ms. Bauer responded that a Tentative MAG Air Quality Project Schedule that provides schedules for many projects was presented to the Committee on August 30, 2001. Also, she explained that the agenda was sent out later than usual to accommodate the tight schedule in submission of the projects and obtaining project data from the member agencies. She apologized for the lateness. Ms. Zielonka asked about an update on the legislative committee regarding issues from HB 2538 and that she thought the committee would meet on October 24, 2001. Ms. Knight noted the meeting date had been shifted to October 26, 2001. Mr. Moore mentioned that with many issues outstanding, it is appropriate to place a hold on modifications to the CMAQ process. Mr. Cleveland announced that the next meeting was scheduled for November 8, 2001. With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.